REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Applicant thanks the Examiner for the Office Action, made final, dated May 8, 2006.

Claim Amendments

The subject-matter of claim 19 has been incorporated into claim 1. Trivial amendments have been made to some of the dependent claims for consistency with claim 1.

It is submitted that these amendments do not create any new issues for consideration by the Examiner.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102

The Applicant contests the Examiner's assertion that the present invention is anticipated by the disclosure of Penn.

In his past two Office Actions, the Examiner rejected claim 19, but without substantiating this rejection. None of the Examiner's comments pertain to claim 19.

Penn discloses a three-dimensional product in the form of a shell of object material 25' surrounding a filler support material 35' (see column 18, lines 17-19 and Figure 14b of Penn). Penn goes on to explain that the filler support material 35' may be dispensed into the shell 25' by way of a spray nozzle or dispenser nozzle (see column 18, lines 32-34).

The Applicant is assuming that the Examiner is referring to Penn's spray nozzle or dispenser nozzle when asserting that Penn discloses an "object incorporation device".

However, Penn does not disclose anywhere an object incorporation device that incorporates inorganic semiconductor devices into a product being printed. Penn only discloses a filler support material 35' being incorporated into a product by a spray or dispenser nozzle.

Accordingly, it is submitted that claim 1, and all claims dependent thereon, are not anticipated by the disclosure of Penn.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

It is, moreover, submitted that the present invention is not obvious in view of Penn. It is clear from the passage at column 18, lines 7-10 that Penn's motivation for using a dispensing nozzle or spray nozzle is not to create three-dimensional products having functional objects incorporated therein, but rather to speed up production and increase the lifetime of its printhead 20 (see also column 18, lines 37-39 of Penn). Penn clearly does not contemplate the formation of electronic products having semiconductor devices incorporates therein, using a printing process.

Therefore, Penn does not provide any motivation for the skilled person to replace its spray nozzle with an object incorporation device that that incorporates inorganic semiconductor devices into a product being printed. A spray nozzle and the Applicant's object incorporation device clearly perform different functions and the skilled person would not consider these to be interchangeable.